

REMARKS

This is in response to the communication mailed on July 21, 2005, in which the Examiner imposed a two-way restriction on the above-identified application. Claims 1-8, 19-24 and 31-36 were identified as a first invention (Group I) drawn to a process of forming a magnetoresistive sensor. Claims 25-30 were identified as a second invention (Group II) drawn to a constricted junction for use in a magnetoresistive sensor, rather than a "constrictor junction" as identified by the Examiner.

Applicant hereby elects, with traverse, to prosecute claims 1-8, 19-24 and 31-36 of Group I.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's finding that the product of Group II can be made by a materially different method from that described in the claims of Group I "such as one that forms the outer shell portion of the junction by coating techniques with predetermined settings of magnetic and electrical conductivity and without the need for any reducing of the magnetic and electrical conductivity or without the need for any ion implantation, as required by Group I."

First, the Examiner fails to describe any particular "coating technique" that could be used to form the product of Group II in a different manner than that described in the claims of Group I. Applicant is unaware of such "coating techniques" and requests that the Examiner describe, with particularity, the alternative method being suggested that would produce the constricted junction of Group II.

Second, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's finding that the outer shell portion of the constricted junction of Group II can be formed "without the need for any ion implantation, as required by Group I." In particular, independent claim 25 describes the constricted junction as comprising "a junction core formed of magnetic and electrically conductive material, and an

ion implanted outer shell portion" Accordingly, the product of Group II could not be formed without ion implantation and the "coating techniques" cited by the Examiner lack the ability to form the claimed "ion implanted outer portion".

As a result the Examiner has failed to identify a method that is materially different from that of Group I, which could be used to form the product of Group II. Accordingly, Applicant believes that the inventions identified by the Examiner as Group I and Group II are not distinct. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: _____



Brian D. Kaul, Reg. No. 41,885
Suite 1400 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

BDK/djb